

[Attorney list on signature page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN JOSE DIVISION *E-FIL

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD.; and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,

Plaintiff,

VS.

RAMBUS INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CV 00-20905 RMW

[] ORDER REGARDING
PRODUCTION OF MATERIALS
SUBJECT TO PRIVILEGE PIERCING
ORDERS IN RELATED CASES

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
U.S.A.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 05-00334 RMW

1
2 RAMBUS INC.,
3
4

Plaintiff,

v.

5 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
6 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
7 SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
8 SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
9 L.P.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 05 02298 RMW

10 RAMBUS INC.,
11
12

Plaintiff,

v.

13 MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and MICRON
14 SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 06-00244 RMW

15
16
17 At the case management conference before the Court on August 3, 2007, Hynix
18 Semiconductor Inc., Hynix Semiconductor America, Inc., Hynix Semiconductor U.K. Ltd., Hynix
19 Semiconductor Deutschland GmbH, and Hynix Semiconductor Manufacturing America Inc.
20 (collectively, “Hynix”), Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc.,
21 Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., and Samsung Austin Semiconductor, L.P. (collectively,
22 “Samsung”), Nanya Technology Corporation and Nanya Technology Corporation U.S.A.
23 (collectively, “Nanya”), and Micron Technology, Inc. and Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.
24 (collectively, “Micron”) requested that the Court order Rambus Inc. (“Rambus”) to produce all
25 materials that Rambus has been ordered to produce pursuant to privilege piercing orders in *Hynix*
26 *Semiconductor, Inc. et al. v. Rambus Inc.*, Civ. A. No. 00-20905 (N.D. Cal. filed Aug. 29, 2000)
27 (“Hynix I case”) and *Micron Technology, Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*, Civ. A. No. 00-792 (D. Del filed
28

1 Aug. 28, 2000) (“Micron Delaware case”) to the parties adverse to Rambus in each of the above-
 2 captioned cases to the extent it had not already done so. Rambus opposed this request. Having
 3 considered the parties’ arguments and good cause appearing,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

5 1. Rambus shall produce all materials that Rambus has been ordered to
 6 produce pursuant to privilege piercing orders in the Hynix I case to Hynix, Samsung, Nanya and
 7 Micron in each of the above-captioned cases to the extent it has not already done so, including
 8 without limitation the materials subject to the Court’s Orders dated February 26, 2004, January
 9 31, 2005, February 28, 2005, August 26, 2005, October 3, 2005, October 19, 2005, and October
 10 20, 2005, and all discovery and testimony taken in connection with such materials, including
 11 without limitation documents, interrogatory responses, deposition testimony and exhibits, trial
 12 testimony and exhibits, and declarations.

13 2. Rambus shall produce all materials that Rambus has been ordered to
 14 produce pursuant to privilege piercing orders in the Micron Delaware case to Hynix, Samsung,
 15 Nanya and Micron in each of the above-captioned cases to the extent it has not already done so,
 16 including without limitation the materials subject to the Court’s Orders dated May 16, 2001,
 17 February 10, 2006, and June 15, 2006, and all discovery and testimony taken in connection with
 18 such materials, including without limitation documents, interrogatory responses, deposition
 19 testimony and exhibits, trial testimony and exhibits, and declarations.

20 3. Rambus shall produce the materials identified above within 15 business
 21 days of entry of this Order without the need for further requests by Hynix, Samsung, Nanya or
 22 Micron.

23 4. By producing these materials in response to this Order, Rambus is not
 24 waiving any protection to which it is otherwise entitled under the attorney-client privilege or
 25 work product doctrine, and nothing in this Order shall preclude Rambus from challenging the
 26 admissibility of any documents or testimony at any trial on any basis, including without limitation
 27 on the basis of the attorney-client privilege and/or work product protection.

28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 9/10/07

Ronald M. Whyte
Harvard University

Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Court Judge

1
2 By /s/ Robert Freitas
3 Robert E. Freitas
4 Kai Tseng
5 Craig R. Kaufman
6 Denise M. Mingrone
7 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
8 Menlo Park, CA 94025

9
10 Attorneys for
11 NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION and NANYA
12 TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION U.S.A.

13 By /s/ Theodore G. Brown
14 Theodore G. Brown, III
15 TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
16 379 Lytton Avenue
17 Palo Alto, California 94301

18 Attorneys for
19 HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
20 AMERICA INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
21 MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC., HYNIX
22 SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD., and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
23 DEUTSCHLAND GmbH

24 **APPROVED ONLY AS TO FORM AND NOT AS TO CONTENT:**

25 DATED: August 20, 2007

26 FOR RAMBUS INC.

27 By /s/ Carolyn Luedtke
28 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

29 Attorneys for
30 RAMBUS INC.